

optimistic" that the United States would obtain guarantees that its agricultural products would gain entry into the Common Market countries.

Concessions on agricultural products are, of course, the key to any industrial agreement. Previously, U.S. "traders" have said that unless the Europeans make some type of "significant" offers which would allow U.S. agricultural entry into the Common Market, no industrial tariff concessions would be granted to their countries.

When our subcommittee held hearings in August of 1966, we were informed that the United States felt agricultural offers from the European Economic Community were totally unacceptable. Now, suddenly, we are told that the lack of any agricultural concessions should not hold up an industrial tariff deal. Quite obviously, American agriculture is being sold out on the sacrificial altar of free trade once again.

Mr. Speaker, as the subcommittee delves deeper into the real status of our trade negotiations in Geneva, I hope that every Member will take the time to examine the committee hearings and findings and see exactly what is being done with U.S. agricultural and industrial markets. If agriculture has already been sold out, it may not be too long until our negotiators, hungry for some shred of concession victory, will give away all our industrial protection as well.

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

(Mr. CHAMBERLAIN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the current furor over the real and alleged activities of the Central Intelligence Agency is a matter of reasonable concern to many Americans. What is not so reasonable is the hysteria with which these revelations have been greeted in some quarters. In the present sensationalist atmosphere it is easy to lose sight of the legitimate role that such an agency must play to safeguard and promote the best interests of the free society in response to a totalitarian adversary that will employ any and all means to gain its ends.

Because of its very nature, an agency such as the CIA cannot undertake to defend itself publicly. Since an objective appraisal of the Agency's activities cannot be made in the press, or on limited and superficial information, taken out of context, it remains for those with the appropriate authority in the Congress and in the Executive to pass judgment. To date there appears to be no expressions of hysteria on their part.

I was impressed with the editorial appearing in the Washington Sunday Star, on February 19, 1967, entitled, "What Are We Trying To Do to the CIA?" It endeavors to put the situation in proper perspective and its timely question is one that all Americans should ponder. I include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

WHAT ARE WE TRYING TO DO TO THE CIA?

It is just possible, if we all manage to work ourselves into a wild enough lather, that the current flap over the CIA can be escalated to the point where it will destroy the nation's intelligence organization. It almost seems that this is what some of the breast-beaters would like to do.

One day we have a disclosure that a student organization has been receiving covert funds so that young Americans can compete with young Communists at world student meetings. Then, suddenly, nothing will do but that every traceable operation of the CIA must be laid bare to public view, commented upon in tones of pious horror, investigated, sermonized, deplored and punished, until the terrible guilt of it all has been established for all time, for all the world to see.

And what, precisely, are we guilty of? Why, of using our wits and available means to compete in a battle just as real, dirty and deadly serious as any shooting war in which we could engage.

Confronted by adversaries who threw the full power and wealth of the state into the effort to mold and control world opinion, we did not abandon the field to them. Instead, we devoted some public funds to seeing to it that Americans could confront the totalitarians in the intellectual lists abroad, speaking their minds in representing the views of a relatively free society.

It worked, incidentally. A wide variety of Americans, most of whom never knew the source of the funds backing them, proved more than able over the years to hold their own in confrontation with disciplined, professional Communist agents. They prevented the takeover of numerous international organizations and established others which have contributed substantially to the global cause of freedom.

Consider for example, the experience of Gloria Steinem, as interestingly reported in yesterday's Washington Post. A New York writer, Miss Steinem was director of something called "The Independent Research Service," which took CIA money to send several hundred young Americans to World Youth festivals in Vienna and Helsinki in 1959 and 1962.

Miss Steinem said she worked closely with CIA agents on the program, but that few of the students who took those trips knew that the CIA was picking up the tab.

"I never felt I was being dictated to at all," she said. "I found them (the CIA men with whom she worked) liberal and farsighted and open to an exchange of ideas. . . . They wanted to do what we wanted to do—present a healthy, diverse view of the United States."

She was backed up by Dennis Shaul, another spokesman for the organization, who said: "We had Minnesota schoolteachers who were further right than Bill Buckley as well as members of Students for a Democratic Society. Nobody told them what to do."

Bear in mind, except for such American participation financed by CIA funds, these festivals were completely dominated by Communists, all financed and controlled by their governments. Yet, says Shaul, "The Helsinki festival was a disaster from their point of view, and I think we can take a good deal of credit for that."

Well now, why not? Is this really something that has to be apologized for? Who is corrupted by such an operation? Who would have paid the Americans' expenses if the CIA hadn't?

"The CIA," says Miss Steinem, "was the only (organization) with enough guts and foresight to see that youth and student affairs were important." And here, the lady puts her finger on an important point.

Of course, it would have been better if

this sort of thing could have been done without subterfuge. It is too bad that private funds were not available for these purposes. It would have been healthier, lacking such private sources, for our government to have appropriated openly the necessary monies, through the State Department, U.S. Information Agency or some other "respectable" organization. Even though no such alternative may have been available when these programs were initiated in the early 1950s, it would have been advisable to switch them away from CIA support as soon as that became possible.

No one, moreover, can possibly defend all the details of any one of these operations. No doubt there have been messy procedures which, when exposed, prove embarrassing. There is, one inevitably recalls, a saying about making omelettes and breaking eggs.

What is beyond comprehension in all this, however, is the monumental naivete involved in the apparent shock reaction to these disclosures on the part of otherwise knowledgeable people. After all, what have the outraged gentlemen supposed was going on all this time on the sprawling acres out at Langley? Of all the endeavors of the CIA, the effort to create outlets abroad for the expression of American opinion must surely rank as one of the milder. This is not, be it noted, a tea party that we have been engaged in. This is a viciously contested undercover war against shrewd, dedicated enemies who happen to be quite unhampered by nice-Nellie scruples. The need to press this fight has all along been recognized by the top leadership of the country. The procedures that suddenly evoke such outraged reactions were not dreamed up privately by the CIA. They were directed from the top, and properly so.

The idea that an organization like the CIA can conduct its operations while restrained by a sort of daisy-chain of clergymen, den mothers and liberal politicians—such a notion is simply absurd. For our part, we hope that the present hysteria will be calmed with a rational inquiry conducted by responsible and realistic men who have some knowledge of the very serious problems involved. We are inclined to suspect that they, and the public, will end up concluding that the world has not, after all, ended—and that, in doing a job which had to be done, our intelligence organization has not done too badly.

WELFARE AND PENSION PLAN PROTECTION ACT OF 1967

(Mr. PERKINS asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the Record and to include an analysis.)

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, we are, as the President has said, beginning to recognize "the right to a meaningful retirement" and "the right to an adequate income." The private pension and welfare funds are vital factors in achieving these rights.

Private welfare and pension plans grow bigger and more numerous every year. Already some \$3 billion is paid out annually to beneficiaries and over \$90 billion has been accumulated. The economic security of millions of American workers and their families is dependent upon the plans ultimately providing benefits for them—benefits which the workers have earned and included in their planning.

The law does not adequately or uniformly protect the funds or their beneficiaries from the risk of financial mis-